1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VONDELL BANKERT, et al.,

No. C-13-4003 EMC

Plaintiffs,

v.

ORDER GRANTING DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO STAY

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB CO., et al.,

(Docket No. 11)

Defendants.

Plaintiffs have filed suit against Defendants for, *inter alia*, strict liability, negligence, breach of warranty, and fraud. The claims are all related to the ingestion of a dug known as Plavix. Those defendants who have appeared (i.e., Bristol-Myers and the Sanofi entities) have moved the Court to stay proceedings in this case because they have "tagged [the] case for transfer [to the Plavix MDL] and anticipate that the JPML will issue a conditional transfer order for [the] case soon." Mot. at 5. Moving Defendants note that twelve different judges in this District – including the undersigned – have granted stays in similar Plavix actions pending transfer to the MDL. See Reply at 2. Moving Defendants also note that the JPML has, for many similar Plavix cases, issued conditional transfer and/or transfer orders.

As Moving Defendants note, this Court previously granted a stay in multiple cases pending a decision by the MDL as to whether the cases should be part of the Plavix MDL. See Docket No. 11 (Ex. D) (order in Kinney v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co., No. C-12-4477 EMC (N.D. Cal.) and related cases). Other judges in this District have done the same. The reasoning in those cases is largely

| applicable here, | and Plaintiffs | have failed t | o convince the | e Court that a | stay would | otherwise be |
|------------------|----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| inappropriate. | | | | | | |

Accordingly, the Court hereby GRANTS Defendants' motion to stay. Plaintiffs' motion to remand is deferred until after the JPML decides whether the case should remain here or be transferred to the Plavix MDL. The hearing on both the motion to stay and the motion to remand is hereby VACATED.

This order disposes of Docket No. 11.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: October 10, 2013

United States District Judge